FAULKNER STUDIES

Spring, 1953 $2.00 yearly
Vol. II, No. 1 .50 a copy

Gavin Stevens: From Rhetoric to Dialectic

OLGA W. VICKERY

In Faulkner's last three books, Gavin Stevens has played an important and, on occasion, controlling part. But more significant is the fact that he appears to be the one character in the Yoknapatawpha series who shows a clear growth and development from book to book. In contrast, Horace Benbow, apart from being older and unhappier, reveals little change of attitude from *Sartoris* to *Sanctuary;* Mrs. Gowan Stevens is simply Temple Drake at once armored with a greater sophistication and rendered more deeply vulnerable by the haunting neuroses of time; the Quentin of *Absalom, Absalom!* repeats the Quentin of *The Sound and the Fury;* and, of course, the ubiquitous Snopeses remain grotesquely themselves whatever the novel.

Gavin Stevens' first appearance is in *Light in August* where in a single scene, after being described and related to his Jefferson context, he comments reflectively on the possible motivation of Mrs. Hines and Joe Christmas. His predilection for ordering and reconstructing past reality into a present, rationally acceptable, verbal pattern is firmly established by his monologue in which he exercises his inductive powers and his ability to generalize from events, an ability not essentially different from Quentin's and Shreve's reconstruction of Sutpen's past. Such ratiocination is after all "a good deal like Sutpen's morality and Miss Coldfield's demonizing." Viewed from the perspective afforded by Faulkner's subsequent works, this scene becomes a dramatic image, an epiphany clearly reflecting Stevens' dual nature. The scene, like Gavin himself, divides neatly into the man on the platform, the living, visible occupant of space and the voice, the invisible embodiment of the rational intellect. Here we have a humanity immersed in the flux of events face to face with a humanity resolutely holding itself at one remove from time; the one is history as lived, the other history as written. It is to this situation that the later *Requiem for a Nun* addresses itself. Only with it do we realize that the immersion in history which accompanies birth is not an act but a condition of existence and that the exercise of the moral dialectic consists in the meshing of the two forms, the synchronizing of the two cycles of history.

Copyright 1953 by Faulkner Studies

In *Intruder in the Dust,* Stevens is still the commentator and reflective observer, but in his comments there is an increased emphasis on moral issues. Nevertheless, while he talks of abstract Justice, Southern rights and responsibilities, it is Chick and Miss Habersham who clear and save Beauchamp. This wide discrepancy between Gavin's words and his actions renders him a study in irony, if not in outright satire. The 'Translation', Heidelberg, Harvard, the Phi Beta Kappa key, all are symbols attached to the disembodied Voice; their function is to underscore the absence of the man. It is this Voice who is the Southern *orator,* the professional moralist, mouthing platitudes about black Sambo, Southern responsibility and Northern interference, quick enough to generalize but too wary to risk acting.

Indeed, throughout the novel, he has many of the qualities and performs a function similar to that of Horace Benbow in *Sanctuary.* The latter had assumed that by articulating his ideals of Justice he could somehow coerce the hard, unpliant reality of circumstance. By bringing order out of chaos he thought that virtue's triumph over evil must follow of necessity. Gavin avoids the disintegration of will which Benbow suffered as a result of discovering the scope and intensity of evil resident in mankind, but he does so by employing language as a rhetorical buttress, a buttress which threatens to imprison him even while it protects. In *Intruder in the Dust,* Stevens is continually placing a cushion of words between himself and the brute reality of human experience and events. By always "explaining" the world, its inhabitants, their motives and impulses, by removing them to the safety (because calculable) of the past, he sterilizes that contagious power to implement significant action which is inherent in the human condition.

In both men it is a principle, or principles, which controls their actions and defines their attitudes to the whole realm of action itself. At the same time, the major difference between them lies in the nature of those principles and presuppositions to which each adheres. Benbow implicitly embraces a revolutionary view of history with the revolutionary's insistence on action, no matter how ineffectual, before it is too late; on the other hand, Stevens aspires to the conservative vision

Faulkner Studies

Faulkner Studies is published quarterly. All manuscripts should be addressed to **Faulkner Studies,** Box 102, University Station, Minneapolis 14, Minnesota. Manuscripts must be accompanied by an addressed envelope and sufficient postage to cover their return. Subscription rates: $2.00 yearly.

EDITORS: Jules Chametzky, Marianne Halley, Edwy B. Lee
PUBLICATION ADVISOR: William Van O'Connor
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Tom E. Francis and Eugene Johnson
BUSINESS MANAGER: Norman Sherman
STAFF: Robert Edenbaum, Rigoberto Juarez-Paz, Melvin M. McCosh, Jane Sherman.

of history and as a result is impressed both by its inevitability and its essential morality. This difference issues in the latter's superb self-assurance which masks his ineffectuality in or rather his indifference to action. Unfortunately, Stevens appears not only to have convinced himself but also his critics of his infallibility and his capacity to control any situation. Talking so much and so long, Stevens is bound to hit upon the truth sometimes, perhaps even quite often, but like anyone else, he does make mistakes and his statements should not be regarded as *ex cathedra* pronouncements or revelations. In short, any simple and easy identification of Faulkner's views with those of Stevens in this book is to be avoided. Faulkner has dramatically embodied the legitimate doubts and misgivings concerning the likes of Benbow and Stevens in Ike McCaslin's rhetorical question: "what distance back to truth must they traverse whom truth could only reach by word-of-mouth?"

Despite the fact that Gavin Stevens too is a lawyer, a poet, a man of words, he does not suffer from either Benbow's futility or his isolation, perhaps because he has learned through experience that the individual must ultimately accept his aloneness and so rely on himself. Indeed, his quasi-quietistic contemplation of human travail is the first, incipient sign that he is acquiring a new maturity and wisdom. In effect he is showing Horace and us that withdrawal from, not immersion in, the flux of circumstance is the initial step toward the acquisition of that historical sense which ultimately guides one to the moral act, the *decision* to engage actively and afresh in human affairs. As a result of his refusal to be tempted into precipitant action, he is not too proud to learn even from an old woman, a child and a Negro boy. Stevens admits or perhaps only concludes that "it doesn't take many three were enough last Sunday night even one can be enough and with enough ones willing to be more than grieved and shamed Lucas will no longer run the risk of needing without warning to be saved." The Voice and the man are beginning to fuse, the index of this being the inescapable and unresolvable uncertainty as to whether the above speech is the man admitting his shortcomings at last or merely the Voice once more concluding and "explaining." Hitherto, no such ambiguity had existed.

Knight's Gambit shows the results of this education: Stevens now acts, at times in defiance of the law, to effect what he considers to be justice. He is still the "split personality; the one, the lawyer, the county attorney who walked and breathed and displayed air; the other, the garrulous facile voice so garrulous and facile that it seemed to have no connection with reality at all. . . ." But the Voice no longer dominates and submerges the man, a point symbolized in the story "Knight's Gambit" by his being involved not only as a lawyer but also as a man in love. At this juncture he is already using law as a means instead

of as an end, retreating where necessary, as in "Monk", but also steadily advancing as he learns to work with circumstance and with instead of against people. He has, however, not yet attained full wisdom, for his determination to see justice done, according to his lights, leads him to play God. He merely replaces the law court as supreme judge, determining guilt and dispensing punishment as he sees fit.

Requiem for a Nun presents the final stage in which he ceases to be the detective-lawyer-judge of *Knight's Gambit*. He is still garrulous, still devoted to oratory and generalizations, but he is no longer content with words as an end product. Simultaneously, he has curbed his tendency to be both judge and jury. His talk is no longer concerned with *post facto* pronouncements; now it serves as a spur goading Temple and Gowan into self-awareness and self-judgment. Relentlessly he forces Temple out of each of her sanctuaries—law, authority, scepticism—and at the same time he insists that she herself take each successive step on the long journey of redemption in which the whole process of history with its sorry betrayal of the individual is retraced even as it is reversed and transcended. While she is rediscovering her humanity which was almost destroyed by her own acts and the acts of her forebears, Stevens takes up the task, begun by Horace Benbow, of exploring truth and justice. Unlike Benbow, his exploration is not *for* but *with* people; condescension is replaced by ministration. In a sense, he willingly destroys his own office and function—the lawyer is supplanted by the attendant priest whose duty is to guide not judge.

Gavin's new function suggests that we are dealing not with a drama, in the accepted sense of the word, but with a Socratic dialogue possessing stage directions. In it, Gavin Stevens, the 'Sage of Yoknapatawpha', becomes a Socratic midwife presiding over the moral dialectic which focusses on Temple Drake. Like Plato's greater creation, his one saving grace in a thankless job is his awareness that he too is humble enough to learn as well as to teach, to be led as well as to lead. It is in this spirit that he heads his companions in an attempt to arrive at some definition of Truth, Justice and Goodness. When their usual identification with Society, Law and Authority has been elaborately analyzed, disproven and discarded, he and the rational intellect have fulfilled their function of preparing the individual for the ultimate turning round and facing of "the brightest blaze of being." Stevens is rightly and necessarily silent as the inarticulate, uneducated Nancy says simply "Believe." Nancy is herself the visible sign which Temple had sought, the concrete illustration of what is meant by 'Believe.' With this, the stage is set for the individual to exercise his own function—to recognize the sign, to engage in the moral dialectic and to make a living reality out of what has been too long merely a word.

Some New Light on Faulkner's *Sanctuary*

PETER LISCA

While work on *Sanctuary* has been successful in clarifying various other aspects of that novel, its relationship to Faulkner's "legend" or "mythology" remains indefinite. It seems to me that the key to the central meaning of *Sanctuary,* and thus its relationship to Faulkner's work, lies in the interpretation of the "trial scene" in chapters XXVII and XXVIII.

While the perjury of Temple Drake is obvious, there has been some speculation as to the motivation for her false testimony. Dr. L. S. Kubie, in a psychological study of the sexual symbolism in *Sanctuary,* concludes: "In the story there is no effort to explain why she [Temple Drake] sacrifices Goodwin, the potent man, to the furies of the mob and saves Popeye, her impotent malfactor." The explanations of those critics who have found reasons for Temple's perjury may be classed in three groups: First, and most frequently advanced, Temple perjures herself because she is afraid of Popeye. Secondly, she has become utterly corrupted by her seducer (a view shared by O'Donnell, who found her "the tacit ally of modernism; her corruption is total . . . she wilfully sees pore White Trash convicted and Lynched"). Thirdly, ". . . her main concern is now to make herself appear as the victim of male brutality, and thus give support to the popular cult of women as 'sanctuaries'."

It is evident that each of these reasons re-arranges the events into a different pattern, giving a correspondingly different meaning to the novel. Therefore, understanding the motivation for her perjury is far more important to the novel's total statement than the perjury itself. My contention is that none of the above explanations fully accounts for many crucial episodes in the novel, and that to place these events functionally in the novel some other theory of Temple's false testimony is necessary. It is my conviction that Temple's perjury is the direct result of pressure exerted by her family.

This implies, of course, that her father and brothers knew the truth about the rape and her subsequent stay at Miss Reba's whorehouse. Their medium of information was a "southron" gentleman—"Cla'ence" Snopes. Horace Benbow, after being told that Temple was on the Goodwin place at the time of Tommy's murder, has gone to Oxford in an attempt to locate her. (She is supposedly at college there.) On his return trip he meets Snopes on the train and the latter engages him in conversation. This conversation is packed with vital information. Among other things, we learn that the Drakes are aware of Temple's absence from school, that they have coined a lie to cover that absence

and have published this lie in the newspapers. (It will be recalled that one of her brothers is a newspaper man.) Also, we learn that Snopes knows Horace is looking for Temple. He is well aware of the reason: "You got a pretty tough case up home there, what I hear."

When Snopes calls Benbow a week later, he has information concerning the whereabouts of Temple. He has found her, quite accidentally, by visiting Fonzo and Virgil Snopes, who are staying at Miss Reba's under the impression that it is a boarding house. When Benbow simulates lack of interest in Snopes' information, the latter warns that he will "dicker with the other party." There can be, at this time, only one other "interested party"—her family. When Benbow next meets Snopes, after having paid him $100.00 for his information, Snopes is "Going down to Jackson [where the Drakes live] for a couple days on a little business. . . ." If there is any doubt as to the nature of this "little business," it is cleared up when we see Snopes again two days later. He is carrying a "sheaf of yellow bills," smoking an expensive cigar (gingerly because of some recent trouble with his teeth), and parading a black eye and broken nose. He is complaining to his barber:

> When a jew lawyer can hold up an American, a white man, and not give him but ten dollars for something that two Americans, southron gentlemen; a judge living in the capitol of the State of Mississippi and a lawyer that's going to be as big a man as his pa some day, and a judge too; when they give him ten times as much for the same thing as a lowlife jew . . .

Snopes had told the barber that his blackeye and broken nose were the result of his having been "hit by a car in Jackson." The barber shrewdly remarks, "What was you trying to sell that car when it run over you?" Snopes' response is, "Have a cigar."

Thus far the evidence that the Drakes were aware of Temple's stay at Miss Reba's whorehouse seems conclusive. It remains to be demonstrated that Temple's perjury was not merely condoned by them, but commanded. Most of the indications pointing to the Drakes' conspiracy against justice are given in the trial itself. The district attorney establishes a socially acceptable account of Temple's actions between the rape and the trial.

> "Where did he [her father] think you were?"
> "He thought I was in school." [a lie, as we have seen]
> "You were in hiding then because something had happened to you and you dared not—"

There can be no doubt as to the close collaboration of Temple, her father, and the attorney. To these and other questions, Temple gives "parrotlike answers," which here means "learned by rote," rehearsed. That the questioning of the district attorney is "leading" is recognized

on two occasions by the presiding judge, who wonders why Horace does not "take exception for some reason." This "reason" will be taken up later.

There is also some proof that Temple is not altogether willing to give her "parrotlike answers." Temple had told Horace, at Miss Reba's, that she would not be afraid to tell the truth in court. This was before she had been located by her family. It is also evident that her belated knowledge of the unnatural rape, her passionate attachment to Red, and the latter's murder while keeping a love tryst had altered her hypnotic fascination for Popeye. After knowing the truth about Popeye's virility and his manner of raping her, she had tried to leave him, expressing her hatred of him in no uncertain terms. Yet she desired Red, and that she could have him only on Popeye's conditions is shown by what happens when she tries otherwise.

Other proofs of the Drakes' conspiracy are evident in the physical details of the courtroom scene. Temple gazes frequently towards the rear of the room, where "Four young men were standing stiffly erect near the exit." With but one or two exceptions, critics have taken these four men to be Popeye's henchmen, in fear of whom she perjures herself. Actually these four young men are her brothers, a fact re-stated in *Requiem* (p. 155). Judge Drake himself plays a part in carrying out the *coup*. He steps forward, in all his genteel dignity, to rescue the witness at that moment when she has said just enough, before she can prejudice the case. As the presiding judge asks, "Defendant, do you waive—", Temple Drake's father "turned slowly, erect above the held breaths, the little white faces, and looked down at the six people at the counsel table." No objection is raised.

When her father begins to take her from the witness stand, she seems reluctant to leave; she ignores his proffered hand. Temple visibly hesitates four times as they are leaving the courtroom, and her father "bent toward her, speaking. . . . She began to cringe back, her body arching slowly, her arm tautening in the old man's grasp." Again, near the door.

> Here they stopped again; the girl could be seen shrunk against the wall just inside the door, her body arched again. She appeared to be clinging there, then the five bodies hid her again and again in a close body the group passed through the door and disappeared.

It seems to me that these actions are unexplainable by any of the current theories for her false testimony.

What great value for the Drakes lay in Temple's perjury? Of what possible advantage was it to them that the world should believe that it was Goodwin who had killed Tommy, and not Popeye? It will be recalled that the district attorney had suggested that Temple was "in hiding" because she was ashamed to face her family after being raped.

It is clear that there is no mention of her relationship with Popeye and Red. As the district attorney presents the case, whoever killed Tommy raped Temple. If Goodwin is accused of the murder and rape, Temple's connection with him is ended, since Goodwin had been jailed immediately after the murder. If, on the other hand, Popeye is accused of the murder, Temple's role as private bawd would be revealed—either through necessity or Popeye's malice. To be raped by a murderer is a regrettable, but in this instance unavoidable misfortune; to become the inmate of a whorehouse for the private amusement of an impotent and perverted gangster would destroy all vestige of honor.

It is now evident, in terms of O'Donnell's "mythology," that the Drakes are the "Sartorises" of the novel. In them the tradition becomes formalized through their complication in Temple's perjury. The "Snopeses" have betrayed them by creating a situation in which the latter must make a "formalized response." They barter the soul of honor for its name in the world. Their tradition has become a "pseudo-tradition." Around this core of meaning accrue all other actions of the novel. The breakdown of traditional moral action into mere "saving face" is observable not only in the Drakes, but in all other members of the "Sartoris" group.

Horace Benbow's contribution to this motif is more subtle than that of the Drakes. He is one of Faulkner's "good-weak" characters. His intentions are good, but he is unable to act effectively in terms of them. There are two reasons why Benbow is ineffectual: First, he himself is tainted with evil. This is perhaps the most important purpose of Faulkner's extensive descriptions of Benbow's relation to his step-daughter, one of incestuous desire, symbolized in the novel by the pervading odor of honeysuckle. That he is painfully aware of his moral sickness is evident at the end of chapter XXIII, where his desires and self-disgust fuse symbolically in the act of vomiting into the toilet on his hands and knees, his mind fusing the images of little Belle and Temple Drake. Another reason for Benbow's moral impotence is that he is trying to serve two masters. He wishes to prove Goodwin innocent, yet he wants to keep Temple within the tradition of Southern Womanhood. This is made obvious by the reluctance with which he becomes aware of Temple's character and the effect that knowledge has on him. Even though he had told her that she could come to the trial in disguise and she had told him she was not afraid to testify against Popeye, he waits until the night before the trial before he can decide to expose her as a witness. By that time it is too late; her family, the "jew lawyer" and Eustace have taken her from Reba's and fixed up her testimony so she can give her "parrotlike" answers.

In Narcissa, we see the tradition decline to a conventional mode of action. She has "a certain position to keep up." She says to Benbow:

"I don't care how many women you have nor who they are. But I can not have my brother mixed up with a woman [Ruby Goodwin] people are talking about . . . that's what people in town think. . . So it doesn't matter whether it's true or not." It is with this attitude toward her brother's efforts for justice that she goes to see the district attorney, giving him information which enables him to locate Temple Drake.

Gowan Stevens, the college boy who took Temple Drake to the Goodwin place and deserted her through cowardice, is the most obvious example of the tradition's decline and needs little comment.

In *Sanctuary,* Faulkner carries this theme of the tradition's decline beyond representative individuals and makes it emblematic of the public bulwark against evil—the law. It is no accident that Temple's father is a judge, that two of her brothers are lawyers, and that Snopes is a senator. Benbow too, of course, is a lawyer. At the beginning of the novel Temple repeatedly uses her family as a symbol of protection against evil. Her eventual awareness of their moral character accounts in part for her bewildered behavior at court. Ruby Goodwin underwent a similar education when she gave herself for two months to a lawyer who promised her legal aid he knew impossible. Another lawyer, the district attorney, "let it be known that he would announce for Congress on his record of convictions." He has a bit of advice for others in his profession: "A losing lawyer is like a losing anything else, ballplayer or merchant or doctor: his business is to—." No mention is made of justice. It will be recalled that lawyers are Reba's favorite customers.

I believe that the title *Sanctuary* refers primarily to this aspect of the novel. In a world where personal integrity and traditional moral action are corrupted, there is no sanctuary in the law. As Faulkner writes in his short story "Smoke", ". . . there are two places where a man does not look at faces; in the sanctuaries of civil law, and in public lavatories."

It seems to me that by understanding Temple's motivation in terms of her family's coercion *Sanctuary* assumes a unity of statement impossible under previous theories, and takes its place in the mainstream of Faulkner's work.

Faulkner's Reputation in Brazil

THEODORE HORNBERGER

The Brazilian literary press, far more generous with its space for literary gossip than for serious reviewing, last year noted Faulkner's trip to Paris and the plans for staging a dramatic version of *Requiem*

for a Nun. Some contemporary Brazilian writers obviously know Faulkner's work at first hand, and the many admirers of André Gide are favorably disposed toward it because of Gide's high praise. Nevertheless, Faulkner is probably not as well known in Brazil as he deserves to be, and I discovered, in conversation, some wonder that he had been awarded the Nobel Prize.

Translations are not a wholly reliable guide to a novelist's reputation in a foreign country, especially in one where most educated persons are competent in at least one language besides their own. Faulkner, moreover, is perhaps an unusually difficult problem for a translator. Still, in a land where there have been translations of nine titles each by Sinclair Lewis and Steinbeck, six by Dos Passos, and five by Hemingway, Faulkner appears relatively neglected. Only *Sanctuary* (*Sanctuário,* by Lígia Junqueira Smith) and *Light in August* (*Luz de Agôsto,* by Berenice Xavier) are available in Brazilian Portuguese. Both appeared in 1948, but only the latter is currently in print. Two of Faulkner's short stories are also available to the Brazilian reader: "That Evening Sun" ("Desceu o Sol," by J. da Cunha Borges) in *Os Mais Belos Contos Norte-americanos* (1945); and "A Rose for Emily" ("Una Rosa para Emily," by Lia Correa Dutra) in *Os Norte-americanos Antigos e Modernos* (1945). Other stories, perhaps, have appeared in magazines or newspapers, which I did not search systematically.

The most extensive treatment of North American literature in Brazilian Portuguese is Morton D. Zabel's *A Literatura dos Estados Unidos* (1947), which gives only one page to Faulkner and rates him below Hemingway—a matter for debate if not recrimination. In his *Escritores Norte-americanos e Outros* (1943), A. Rolmes Barbosa commented upon what at first sight seems disorder in a Faulkner novel, and Gomes Freire, writing an introduction to a recent edition of Robert Nathan's *Long after Summer* (*Depois do Verão,* 1951), has acutely observed that Faulkner may owe something structurally to the detective novel. These scattered comments are about the extent of critical writing on Faulkner readily accessible to a Brazilian reader who lacks command of English.

In short, Brazilians would seem to have some knowledge of the technical interest of Faulkner's fiction but to be almost unaware of its epic proportion and complexity. Of the aspects of Faulkner for which critical exegesis is both appropriate and necessary — symbol, myth, and allegory, for example—most Brazilians have yet to learn.

Faulkner Critics: A Bibliography Breakdown

BRADLEY T. PERRY

This bibliography breakdown is limited to reviews and essays about specific Faulkner works. Criticism of a general nature has been omitted. The bibliography will be completed in the next issue.

Absalom, Absalom! (1936)

Brooks, Cleanth. *"Absalom, Absalom:* The Definition of Innocence. *Sewanee Review,* 59 (Autumn, 1951). Pp. 543-548.

DeVoto, B. "Witchcraft in Mississippi." *Saturday Review of Literature,* 15 (October 31, 1936). Pp. 3-4.

Hoffman, A. C. "Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!" The Explicator,* 10 (November, 1951).

Morris, Wright. "The Violent Land—Faulkner and Expressionism. *Magazine of Art,* 45 (March, 1952). Pp. 99-103.

Sullivan, Walter. "The Tragic Design of *Absalom, Absalom!" South Atlantic Quarterly,* 50 (October, 1951). Pp. 552-66.

Reviews:

Anonymous. *Saturday Review of Literature,* 15 (December 5, 1936) P. 58. 400 words.

———— Springfield *Republican.* November 8, 1936. P. 7e. 500 words.

———— *Time,* 28 (November 2, 1936). P. 67. 600 words.

Brickell, Herschel. *Review of Reviews,* 94 (December, 1936). P. 15. 190 words.

Colum, M. M. *Forum,* 97 (January, 1937). P. 35. 1050 words.

Cowley, M. *New Republic,* 89 (November 4, 1936). P. 22. 1100 words.

Mann, D. L. Boston *Transcript.* October 31, 1936. P. 6. 850 words.

Paterson, Isabel. *Books.* October 25, 1936. P. 3. 1350 words.

Strauss, Harold. New York *Times.* November 1, 1936. P. 7. 750 words.

Troy, William. *Nation,* 143 (October 31, 1936). P. 524. 1100 words.

As I Lay Dying (1930)

Campbell, Harry M. "Experiment and Achievement; *As I Lay Dying* and *The Sound and the Fury." Sewanee Review,* 51 (April, 1943). Pp. 305-20.

Capote, Truman. "Faulkner Dances; V. Betti's Adaptation of *As I Lay Dying*." *Theatre Arts,* 33 (April, 1949). P. 49.

Reviews:

Anonymous. *New Republic,* 65 (November 19, 1930). P. 27. 180 words.

———— New York *Times.* October 19, 1930. P. 6. 800 words.

Davenport, Basil. *Saturday Review of Literature,* 7 (November 22, 1930). P. 362. 750 words.

Dawson, M. C. *Books.* October 5, 1930. P. 6. 650 words.

Fadiman, C. P. *Nation,* 131 (November 5, 1930). P. 500. 550 words.

Dr. Martino and Other Stories (1934)

Reviews:

Anonymous. Boston *Transcript.* June 30, 1934. P. 2. 300 words.

———— London *Times* Lit. Sup. September 13, 1934. P. 618. 450 words.

———— *Saturday Review of Literature,* 10 (September 22, 1934). P. 151. 80 words.

Benet, W. R. *Saturday Review of Literature,* 10 (April 21, 1934). P. 151. 80 words.

Brickell, Herschel. *North American,* 237 (June, 1934). P. 570. 40 words.

Butcher, Fanny. Chicago *Daily Tribune.* April 21, 1934. P. 17. 300 words.

Garnett, David. *New Statesman and Nation,* 8 (September 29, 1934). P. 396. 100 words.

Kronenberger, Louis. New York *Times.* April 22, 1934. P. 9. 950 words.

Marsh, F. T. *Books.* April 15, 1934. P. 7. 580 words.

Matthews, T. S. *New Republic,* 79 (May 23, 1934). P. 51. 70 words.

Plomer, William. *Spectator,* 153 (September 28, 1934). P. 454. 630 words.

Go Down Moses (1942)

Reviews:

Anonymous. London *Times* Lit. Sup. October 10, 1942. P. 497.

———— *New Yorker,* 18 (May 16, 1942). P. 74.

———— *Pratt.* October, 1942. P. 12.

———— *Time,* 39 (May 11, 1942). P. 95.

Abrahams, William. Boston *Globe.* May 6, 1942. P. 19. 320 words.

Andrew, G. G. *Canadian Forum,* 22 (August, 1942). P. 155. 420 words.

Beresford, J. D. Manchester *Guardian*. October 9, 1942. P. 3. 100 words.

Cowley, Malcolm. *New Republic*, 106 (June 29, 1942). P. 90. 850 words.

Gay, R. M. *Atlantic Monthly*, 170 (September, 1942). P. 136. 230 words.

Graves, John Temple II. *Saturday Review of Literature*, 25 (May 2, 1942). P. 16. 500 words.

Gregory, Horace. New York *Times*. May 10, 1942. P. 4. 1300 words.

Littell, Robert. *Yale Review*, 31 (Summer, 1942). 140 words.

O'Brien, Kate. *Spectator*, 169 (October 30, 1942). P. 418. 150 words.

Rugoff, Milton. *Books*. May 17, 1942. P. 2. 1000 words.

Toynbee, Philip. *New Statesman and Nation*, 24 (October 31, 1942). P. 293. 220 words.

Trilling, Lionel. *Nation*, 154 (May 30, 1943). P. 632. 1150 words.

A Green Bough (1933)

Schappes, Morris U. "Faulkner as a Poet." *Poetry*, 43 (October, 1943). Pp. 48-52.

Reviews:

Anonymous. Boston *Transcript*. July 15, 1933. P. 3. 220 words.

———— *Nation*, 136 (May 17, 1933). P. 565. 200 words.

Benet, W. R. *Saturday Review of Literature*, 9 (April 29, 1933). P. 565. 1050 words.

Jack, P. M. New York *Times*. May 14, 1933. P. 2. 850 words.

Walton, E. L. *Books*. April 30, 1933. P. 2. 850 words.

News and Comments

Faulkner Studies is now being published in Minneapolis. The editorial staff has changed but the program will remain essentially the same. Beginning with this issue, however, more space in *Faulkner Studies* will be devoted to Faulkner's reputation and influence abroad—more annotations of foreign articles, newsletters from Brazil, Italy, France, England. This quarter's contributors: OLGA W. VICKERY, co-editor with Frederick J. Hoffman of *William Faulkner: Two Decades*

Books by and about William Faulkner — Other Books, Too

McCosh's Book Store
1405 5th Street SE
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

of Criticism, is teaching at Mount Holyoke College and working on extended analyses of Faulkner's novels preparatory to a full-length critical study. Her article on Gavin Stevens is an off-shoot of one of these analyses. PETER LISCA is a teaching assistant at the University of Wisconsin, working for the Ph.D. in English. BRADLEY T. PERRY teaches at Mitchell College and Admiral Ballard Academy in New London, Connecticut. THEODORE HORNBERGER, Chairman, Department of English, University of Minnesota, was Visiting Professor of North American Literature in the University of Brazil for the academic year 1951-1952. You are cordially invited to subscribe, and remember, your contributions are as important to the success of the quarterly as are your subscriptions. The new address: *Faulkner Studies*, Box 102, University Station, Minneapolis 14, Minnesota.

(M.H.)

Bibliography

"A Saga of the Deep South," *Times Literary Supplement*, p. 104, February 13, 1953.

> The author of this appraisal of the pattern of Faulkner's work carries on the Cowley thesis and demonstrates a sensitiveness to the experimental works. Lust masquerading as love is one of the important themes of Faulkner's stories; pride is seen as the ruling passion of his characters. The later Faulkner is conceived of as an intense moralist and a sometimes unsuccessful artist. (E.B.L.)

Breton, M. le, *"Temps et Personne chez* William Faulkner," *Journal de Psychologie Normale et Pathologique*, 1-2:344-354, January-June, 1951.

> Faulkner is the vulgarizer of the interior monologue technique picked up from Joyce and Virginia Woolf. He gives a large role to the irrational in his pessimistic scheme of things. Faulkner's philosophical position and the technique which expresses it correspond to a profound psychological truth. The confusion of past and present is also a confusion of Me with not-Me. The derangement of time is associated with the derangement of personality. Comparisons are made between **The Sound and the Fury** and **Mrs. Dalloway, To the Lighthouse** and **Orlando.** (E.B.L.)

Gwynn, Frederick L., "Faulkner's Prufrock—and Other Observations," *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 52:63-70, January, 1953.

> The first two sections of **Mosquitoes** grow out of Eliot's **Prufrock** and from **The Waste Land.** The echoes of Eliot in this novel are

verbal and atmospheric, and two of the characters, Mr. Taliafero and Mrs. Maurier, are modeled on Eliot's Prufrock and Lady. Two factors are to be noted: (1) Eliot's pervasive influence on modern writing, even into the realm of such an original as Faulkner, and (2) Faulkner's weakness—stemming from a heavy-handed and unsympathetic treatment—in this atypical literary satire. (J.C.)

Hamilton, Edith, "Faulkner: Sorcerer or Slave?", *The Saturday Review*, 38: 8-10, 39-41, July 12, 1952.

Faulkner is a romantic in his attempt to escape reality. He is a modern romantic, the most brilliant of the moderns, in that he detests nature. There is an exclusive preoccupation with ugliness in his work and, because of his Puritan background, beauty, sex, enjoyment are suspect. Faulkner's books "remind us only of the futility of all things human, and the certain defeat of all men's struggles." His Nobel Prize speech contained noble sentiments; he felt the need to express certain universal truths, but the speech was belied by **Requiem for a Nun,** his next literary production, in which romanticism and sentimentality overtake and overwhelm him. (J.C.)

Humphrey, Robert, "Form and Function of Stream of Consciousness in William Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*," *University of Kansas City Review,* 19:34-40, Autumn, 1952.

Faulkner uses the interior monologue technique because he realizes the significance of the drama enacted within the human psyche. He substitutes symbolic structure and motif, scenic arrangement and unity of time for conventional unity of action and character. In the Benjy and Quentin sections the "premeditative" images and symbols of psychic conflict replace rationally formulated ideas—in contrast to the conflictless, amoral Snopes world accepted by Jason. The Jason section, therefore, is presented in surface soliloquoy and conventional omniscient narration. (R.E).

Justo, Luis, *"La antropología de Faulkner. A propósito de 'Gambito de caballo,'"* *Sur,* 206:126-130, December, 1951.

Faulkner's work should not be considered national or regional, and it does not make much sense to say that he has revived Greek tragedy. Faulkner's characters belong to an "exclusively anatomic order," and there seems to be a deliberate attempt to hide any spiritual significance they may have. The tragic situation cannot arise for men who are essentially organisms. Furthermore, these characters are led to a hell they do not deserve, since their misfortune results from knowledge rather than from ignorance. For these reasons it seems absurd to say that Faulkner has revived Greek tragedy. (R.J.-P.)

Mayoux, J.-J., *"La création du Réel chez* William Faulkner," *Etudes Anglaises,* 5:25-39, February, 1952.

The first page of *Sanctuary* is given intensive analysis as typical of Faulkner's ability to lead the reader into the scene instead of bringing the scene before the reader. This scene is typical also of Faulkner's use of symbolic characterization; he uses *correspondances* which pull the organic toward the inorganic. His best work is in that tradition which sees matter as signs, symbols and forces pushing toward existence. In Kafka we are before the reality of a dream—in Faulkner we are before the dream of a reality. *Sanctuary* and *Absalom, Absalom!* are treated as most representative, with less detailed mention of *Pylon, The Wild Palms* and *Light in August.* (E.B.L.)

Rosenfeld, Isaac, "Faulkner and Contemporaries," *Partisan Review,* 18:106-109, January-February, 1951. (Rev. *Collected Stories.*)

The collection forms a commentary on all of Faulkner's work, revolving around the basic themes of blood, land, and the fusion of the two in human character. While Faulkner's greatness is inseparable from his Southern qualities, he does not write well in his main concern with Southern history and legend: in part this is due to the weakness of the legend itself. The greatest story in the collection, "Red Leaves," succeeds because it is written not about the South, but *over* it: a victory over the impossible legend. (M.H.)

West, Ray B., Jr., "Hemingway and Faulkner—Two Masters of the Short Story," *The Short Story in America 1900-1950, Chicago*s Henry Regnery Company, 1952, pp. 85-106.

A survey of stories by Faulkner and Hemingway with particular emphasis on several representative of 'types': (1) those in which the myth is examined in terms of a present, completed action, as in "A Rose for Emily," and (2) the story of "initiation" and "recognition," in which the central consciousness progresses from innocence to knowledge and recognition of evil, or to a realization, as in "That Evening Sun," of the limitations of nature (the present) and the myth (the past). A story like "The Bear" combines elements of both types. It creates the background myth against which the events are enacted, incorporates the ritual of initiation, and relies less upon abstract concepts. This fuller objectification characterizes Faulkner's finest work in the story form. (R.E.)